DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 391 948 CE 070 852

AUTHOR Bugarin, Alicia
TITLE Restructuring Workforce Preparation Policy. Issue Summary.
INSTITUTION California State Library, Sacramento. California Research Bureau.
REPORT NO CRB-IS-95-004
PUB DATE Oct 95
NOTE 55p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Agency Cooperation; Coordination; Educational Administration; Educational Change; *Educational Policy; *Education Work Relationship; Federal State Relationship; *Job Training; *Labor Force Development; Needs Assessment; Policy Formation; Program Administration; Program Improvement; State Agencies; State of the Art Reviews; *Statewide Planning; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

This document presents the findings of a review of federal and state job training programs and governance structures in California that was commissioned to identify options for restructuring California's work force preparation policy and governance of the state's system of work force preparation programs through vocational education, job training, and school-to-work initiatives. It was concluded that California's work force preparation policy and administrative structure is fragmented and that this fragmentation may be impeding efficient provision of high-quality, responsive, and easily available services to workers and employers. The following policy options were suggested: (1) establish a single state council for policy direction, consolidate multiple employment and training programs under one administrative agency, and mirror that consolidated policy and service delivery structure at the local level; (2) create an independent umbrella work force preparation council without replacing existing advisory councils, and continue the existing state and local program administrative structure pending the new council's recommendations; (3) maintain the existing structure at the state and local levels; and (4) partner with the federal government to enhance program and service delivery flexibility by negotiating waivers of federal regulations in exchange for the delivery of mutually agreed-upon outcomes. (Contains 43 references.) (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 391 948

CRB *California Research Bureau, California State Library*

Issue Summary

Restructuring Workforce Preparation Policy

By

Alicia Bugarin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A Bugarin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

October 1995

California Research Bureau
California State Library
CRB-IS-95-004

900 N Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, California 95814
(916) 653-7843

CE 070 852

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CRB *California Research Bureau, California State Library*

Issue Summary

Restructuring Workforce Preparation Policy

By

Alicia Bugarin

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DIGEST 2

INTRODUCTION 3

FEDERAL WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES 8

Block Grant Proposals 8
State Structure 8
Local Infrastructure 9

The Job Training Partnership Act 10
The State Job Training Coordinating Council 10
Human Resource Investment Council 11
Super Councils 14
Council Outcomes 20

SELECTED STATE COMPARISONS 21

Oregon 21
Mission and Composition of the Oregon Workforce Quality Council 22
Responsibilities 22
Regional Workforce Quality Committees 25

Massachusetts 26
Mission of the MassJobs Council 26
Composition and Responsibilities of the MassJobs Council 27
Regional Employment Boards 27
Regional Economic Development Projects 28

Texas 29
Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness 29
Texas Workforce Commission 30
Local Workforce Development Boards 31

Michigan 32
Michigan Jobs Commission 32
Michigan's Workforce Commission 33

CALIFORNIA 34

SB 1417 Testimony--Issues 37

LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE OPTIONS 43

Summary of Options 43
Option I 43
Option II 47
Option III 48
Option IV 48

BIBLIOGRAPHY 50

DIGEST

This Issue Summary examines federal and state job training programs and governance structures. The research was requested by Senator Patrick Johnston. Senator Johnston's bill, SB 1417 (Chapter 819, Statutes of 1994), required the State Job Training Coordinating Council to submit to the Governor and the Legislature by April 1995, recommendations on the appropriate organizational structure, scope, mission and membership of a statewide workforce preparation council. The Council deferred its recommendations until April 1, 1996. This research is intended in part to assist in that process.

California's workforce preparation programs (which include vocational education, job training, and school-to-work) appear to be ripe for restructuring. The state has 22 employment and training programs administered by 13 separate agencies (excluding higher education). These programs provided a variety of employment and training services to 6.7 million persons at a cost of approximately $6 billion in Fiscal Year (FY) 1994. Many of the programs and requirements are federal, although the majority of funding is provided by the state (primarily for vocational education). The state's role is to develop a strategic plan for service delivery, establish programs, distribute and administer funds, monitor implementation, and provide technical assistance to local entities. Actual services are delivered by local entities.

Vocational education and job training programs serve a critical need in today's highly competitive, rapidly changing global economy. Numerous studies indicate that employers want a worker with a broad set of workplace skills, or at least a strong educational foundation that will facilitate learning on the job. Deficiencies in basic skills create barriers for entry-level employees, for experienced employees who want to advance, and for dislocated workers who must adapt to economic and technological change. Furthermore, many researchers contend that non-college bound youth require extensive assistance to transition from school into the workforce (although a recent study disagrees with that finding).[1]

Economic development is driven by business/worker ties, which enable a productive working relationship and facilitate customer service. The public sector task is to create an effective workforce training system. Many states are streamlining job training and vocational educational programs and resources and improving service delivery. In addition, a bipartisan Congressional effort is underway to reform and consolidate 154 dispersed federal job training programs, replacing them with a comprehensive workforce development system that will block grant federal funds for labor and employment programs to the states. State governance and strategic planning issues are central to implementing these changes in a manner which maximizes efficient service delivery and promotes improved client outcomes.

---

[1] Jacob Alex Klerman, Lynn A. Karoly. The Transition to Stable Employment: The Experience of U.S. Youth in Their Early Labor Market Career. National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California, Berkeley. RAND. 1995.

INTRODUCTION

California's 22 labor and employment programs, 13 administering departments (see Table 1, page 3), and 10 advisory councils (see page 34), provided employment and training services to 6.7 million people at a cost of $6 billion in FY 1994. There is reason to think that the state's fragmented workforce preparation policy and administrative structure may impede efforts to efficiently provide high quality, responsive, and easily available services to workers and employers. No single entity is responsible for state workforce policy development or implementation. Counter-productive turf issues influence reform discussions.

Research suggests that a fragmented governance structure for job training and employment-related services can have several dysfunctional results:

- Incompatible policies and procedures which impede collaboration and effective service delivery;
- Job training of an uneven quality;
- An inability to meet the multiple service needs of clients;
- Duplicative and expensive administrative structures; and
- Fragmented planning that makes it difficult to upgrade services in response to changing economic conditions.

Congress is considering block granting workforce development funds to the states and decreasing federal funding. The proposals require that states and local jurisdictions redesign their employment and training programs into a coherent and well-planned *workforce development system*. Many states have already initiated a restructuring process. At least 19 states have created Human Resource Investment Councils or "super councils" to plan and coordinate state strategies. Some states have also consolidated their state level workforce development programs under one agency. Others have created local boards that are responsible for the planning and oversight of all locally delivered workforce training and service programs.

Table 1

Workforce Preparation Programs in California

State Agency	Program	Persons Served [a] (in whole numbers)	Total Funding (in thousands)
Dept. of Aging	Senior Community Service Employment	1,145	6,938 [e]
CA Conservation Corps	Training & Work Program	1,725	50,151[g]
CA Youth Authority	Youth Employment	14,817	not available [b]
Dept. of Corrections	Inmate Employment	67,783	62,028f
	Vocational Education for Inmates	9,931	44,249[g]
Employment Development Dept.	Job Agent Program	3,087	3,430[g]
	Job Service	1,186,067	97,780[g]
	Job Training Partnership Act	215,752	542,122[c]
	Intensive Services Program	19,997	8,289[g]
	Special Veterans Services	26,238	18,821[c]
	Wagner-Peyser 10% Projects	8,291	9,755[c]
Employment Training Panel	Training & Economic Development Program	26,925	74,800f
Dept. of Industrial Relations	Apprenticeship Training	38,700	4,019[g]
Dept. of Rehabilitation	Vocational Rehabilitation Services	141,853	255,143[g]
Dept. of Social Services	Food Stamp Employment & Training	350,179	42,740[g]
	Greater Avenues for Independence	128,231	268,000[g]
	Refugee Assistance Services	50,135	32,594[c,e]
State Personnel Board	Career Opportunity Development	250	1,976[c]
CA Community Colleges	Postsecondary Vocational Education	1,400,00[d]	3,144,200[g]
Dept. of Education	Adult Education	1,860,000[d]	437,223[g]
	Secondary Vocational Educational & Regional Occupational Center Programs	1,200,000	907,480[g]
Military Dept.	Urban Youth Corps	250	600[c]
	TOTAL	6,751,356	6,012,338

a. The most recent figures available are presented here. Depending upon the program, the figures are for Fiscal Year 1992-93, 1993-94, or 1994-95.
b. The Youth Authority does not separately track funds for Youth Employment Activities.
c. Fiscal Year 1993-94 funding. All other funding figures are Fiscal Year 1994-95.
d. Total registrations (does not separate workforce preparations registrants from total registrations).
e. Federal funding.
f. State funding.
g. Combination of federal and state funding (Funding is for total registrations).

Source: *SJTCC; EDD.* Funding figures appear to be approximations (CRB added Military Dept. and made other changes)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

California's employment and training programs were created between 1917 to 1993 to address the needs of specific populations. The separately administered programs each operate under a different set of rules. Nonetheless many of these programs perform similar functions and target overlapping client groups (see Tables 2 and 3, pages 6-7). A recent General Accounting Office (GAO) study analyzed the overlap among federal programs that target four groups: the economically disadvantaged, dislocated workers, older workers, and youth. GAO found that programs serving these groups share common goals, often serve the same categories of clients, offer comparable services, and administer parallel delivery systems. At the local level resources are often shared, and in some cases the "relationship between the programs was so close that it was difficult to determine which program was providing which services to the client."[2]

California's 22 employment and training programs generally target their services to one or more of the following client groups:

Job Ready Persons have occupational skills which are in demand in the labor market but need assistance in finding a job.

Dislocated Workers have been laid off by an organization that is closing or downsizing. They possess occupational skills and experience but have limited opportunities to become reemployed in the same or a similar job.

Youth are generally defined as persons 21 years of age or younger with little or no job experience. They may be students, graduates or school dropouts.

Public Aid Recipients receive financial assistance from programs such as Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Food Stamps, or Supplemental Security Income (SSI).

Veterans are persons who have served in the active military service and were honorably discharged.

Disabled Persons have physical, mental or emotional impairments which affect their prospects for employment.

Older Workers are generally defined as persons 55 years of age or older.

Low Income Persons have only a basic subsistence standard of living and may (but often do not) qualify for public assistance.

Offenders are persons who have been convicted of a felony and are presently incarcerated in an adult or youth corrections facility, or are on probation or parole. [3]

---

[2]United States General Accounting Office. Multiple Employment Training Programs. Overlap Among Programs Raises Questions About Efficiency. July 1994.
[3]Employment Development Department. Employment and Training Programs in California. November 1992.

Table 2

PROGRAMS BY MAJOR TARGET CLIENT GROUPS

PROGRAM	CLIENT GROUPS								
	Job Ready	Dislocated Workers	Youth	Public Aid	Vets	Disabled Workers	Older Workers	Low Income	Offender
POSTSECONDARY VOC. EDUCATION	X	X		X		X			X
SECONDARY VOC., EDUCATION, ROCs/Ps			X			X			X
ADULT EDUCATION		X		X		X	X		X
JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT		X	X	X	X		X	X	
GAIN				X					
VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES			X	X		X			
JOB SERVICE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PANEL PROGRAM	X	X							
CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS (TRAINING & WORK)			X						
REFUGEE ASSISTANCE SERVICES				X					
INMATE EMPLOYMENT									X
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR INMATES									X
SPECIAL VETERANS SERVICES					X	X			
FOOD STAMP EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING								X	
WAGNER-PEYSER 10% PROJECTS			X	X		X		X	
INTENSIVE SERVICES PROGRAM				X				X	
SENIOR COMMUNITY EMPLOYMENT SERVICE							X	X	
YOUTH (WARD) EMPLOYMENT			X						X
APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING	X								X
JOB AGENT PROGRAM				X				X	X
URBAN YOUTH CORPS			X					X	
CAREER OPPORTUNITY DEVELOPMENT				X		X			
TOTALS	**4**	**5**	**9**	**12**	**3**	**9**	**4**	**7**	**8**

Source: *Employment Development Department/Updated By CRB*

Table 3

PROGRAMS BY MAJOR FUNCTION

PROGRAM	FUNCTIONS				
	Job Placement	Basic Remedial	OJT*	Voc. Ed.	Support Services
POSTSECONDARY VOC. EDUCATION	X	X		X	
SECONDARY VOC., EDUCATION, ROCs/Ps	X	X	X	X	
ADULT EDUCATION		X		X	
JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT	X	X	X	X	X
GAIN	X	X	X	X	X
VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES	X	X	X	X	X
JOB SERVICE	X				
EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PANEL PROGRAM	X		X	X	
CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS (TRAINING & WORK)	X	X		X	
REFUGEE ASSISTANCE SERVICES	X	X			X
INMATE EMPLOYMENT			X		
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR INMATES				X	
SPECIAL VETERANS SERVICES	X				
FOOD STAMP EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING	X			X	
WAGNER-PEYSER 10% PROJECTS	X	X	X		X
INTENSIVE SERVICES PROGRAM	X				X
SENIOR COMMUNITY EMPLOYMENT SERVICE	X		X		
YOUTH (WARD) EMPLOYMENT	X	X	X		
APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING		X	X		
JOB AGENT PROGRAM	X				X
URBAN YOUTH CORPS		X			
CAREER OPPORTUNITY DEVELOPMENT			X		
TOTALS	**16**	**12**	**11**	**10**	**7**

Job Placement is the process of linking the client (trainee) with the employer.
Basic Remedial Education is instruction in reading, writing, computing and problem solving.
**On-the-Job Training* provides job-specific skills at the actual work site.
Vocational Education is provided in an institutional setting, and is designed to provide clients with necessary skills to attain entry-level employment.
Employment and Training Support Services are services or benefits provided to clients, such as: income maintenance, child care, health services, legal aid and transportation assistance.

Source: *Employment Development Department Updated By CRB*

FEDERAL WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES

Block Grant Proposals

Both the House and the Senate are currently considering bipartisan proposals to unify 90 to 100 federal categorical programs in up to four separate employment and training block grants. The proposals would merge or terminate existing job training programs and replace them with block grants. All of the proposals would authorize between 9 and 20 percent less in total state funding[4] than the current categorical program scheme provides. Significant funding reductions appear likely, whether or not block grants are enacted.

Federal block grant proposals address common issues. They seek to eliminate duplication in the administration and delivery of services, establish common data collection and reporting requirements, provide universal access to local services through a "one-stop" delivery system, use vouchers to allocate funds at the local level, and require the use of performance standards and outcome measures. The new flexibility, and likely reduced funding, raise important issues for state policy makers:

- Who will be responsible for developing a strategic plan for the administration of block grant funds?
- Who will administer the state's block grant and how will the state's multiple advisory councils and 13 departments organize to distribute these funds?
- What governance structure at the state, regional and local levels would best streamline oversight and planning functions, reduce redundancy and waste, and develop comprehensive policies and priorities?
- How can the state improve workforce preparation services to employers and employees in a manner that contributes to economic development?
- How will funds be allocated?
- Who will oversee the service providers?
- How will performance be measured?
- What sanctions should be instituted for non-performers?

State Structure

Both House and Senate block grant proposals give state governors the ability to appoint a State Workforce Development Council and require that all relevant state agencies be included in any planning process. The council's objective would be to develop a single comprehensive statewide workforce development system. The bills generally require the state plan to establish goals and criteria in the following general areas:

- The design and boundaries of local service delivery areas;
- The establishment of local employer-led workforce development boards;
- The design and selection of one-stop local delivery systems and vouchers;

---

[4]National Governors' Association. Congressional Budget Action: Possible Impact on the States. June 30, 1995.

- The creation of uniform performance measurements and state benchmarks;
- The development of a certification process for providers of education and training; and
- The design of an adult training system, including services for special populations such as the disadvantaged and older workers.

The legislation contemplates the active and continuous participation of business, industry, and labor in the development and operation of a workforce development system. A majority of council members would represent business and industry, labor, and community-based organizations. In addition, the council would include representatives from state and local government, education, and other employment and training program stakeholders.

Local Infrastructure

The governor and locally-elected officials would designate regional Workforce Development Areas throughout the state. These Workforce Development Areas would be responsible for distributing funds and delivering services through a local one-stop delivery system. The state's role would be limited to providing technical support.

Local Workforce Development Boards would serve as planning and oversight bodies. A majority of their membership would include representatives from business and industry, as well as labor, community-based organizations, educational institutions, and individuals with disabilities. The boards would be responsible for:

- Developing local strategic workforce development plans;
- Identifying occupations in demand and associated training needs;
- Establishing and overseeing a "one-stop" career center system, including developing and approving budgets and operating plans;
- Establishing performance measures and evaluating the performance of local service providers;
- Reviewing adult training, at-risk youth and local vocational rehabilitation services; and
- Serving as an advisory body for all youth workforce preparation activities.

The "one-stop" career centers would either unify services at a single site or electronically. They would offer vouchers to eligible adults for certified education and training programs. Individuals would be able to receive information on jobs in demand, the skills required for those jobs, and the quality/costs/outcomes of relevant local education and training programs. The centers would also offer job search assistance, assessment, counseling, and referral.[5] Dislocated workers would be able to sign up for unemployment insurance. The goal is to bring together fragmented programs into a cohesive, more accessible, customer-driven system which better serves its clientele.

---

[5]National Governors' Association. The CAREERS Act of 1995. May 9, 1995.

The Job Training Partnership Act

The last major change in federal workforce preparation policy occurred in 1982, when the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) was enacted by Congress with bipartisan support (Senators Kennedy and Quayle were the original co-authors). JTPA created new job training and workforce preparation programs for under-skilled and long-term unemployed youth and adults, older workers, and laid off or dislocated workers. The Act established federally-funded, state-administered programs with significant local and private sector participation.

JTPA is the state's principal source of federal job training funds. In FY 1994, California received $542 million in JTPA funds. The Family Economic Security Act (Unemployment Insurance Code Sections 15000-16010) is California's enabling legislation.

The State Job Training Coordinating Council

JTPA requires participating states to establish a State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC). The Act specifies the council's purpose, which is to act in an advisory, policy making, coordinating and oversight role for the Governor. The council's primary responsibilities include:

- *Recommend a Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan.* This biannual report outlines goals and objectives meant to provide guidance to state agencies and local officials in planning for the delivery of federal and state funded job training and placement services.

- *Recommend appropriate local Service Delivery Areas (SDAs)*, of which California has 52.

- *Coordinate activities with local Private Industry Councils (PICs),* local governing boards in each SDA composed of a majority of private sector members. This requirement is intended to increase private sector involvement in curriculum development and program oversight.

- *Develop linkages* with programs and services provided by other state and local education agencies including vocational education, public assistance, housing, rehabilitation, the employment service, postsecondary institutions, economic development agencies, and homeless programs.

- *Advise the Governor and SDAs* on local job training plans and certify their consistency with the Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan, recommending approval or modification as appropriate.

- *Identify employment, training and vocational education needs* throughout the state.

California's SJTCC was established in 1983 (Unemployment Insurance Code Sections 15035-15039.7) and is located in the Employment Development Department. In establishing the Council, the Legislature directed it "to promote integration of employment and training programs at the state level, to further cooperation between government and the private sector in meeting California employers' needs for well-trained workers and California workers' needs for good jobs,

(and) to provide oversight of programs...".[6] The council is composed of 30 members appointed by the Governor: 9 from business, 9 from state and local government, 9 from organized labor and community-based organizations, and 3 from the general public.

A 1988 study assessed the State Job Training Coordinating Council's impact on California's job training system. The study found that: "the Council's impact was generally perceived as limited, with greater impact perceived at the state than at the local level."[7] The report identified barriers that limited the council's effectiveness including turf disputes among pertinent state agencies, the council's close identification with JTPA and its administering agency, the Employment Development Department, and the perception that job training was a relatively low state priority.[8] Local Service Delivery Area staff and service providers reported that the council's policy initiatives had relatively little effect on local job training programs. Other JTPA studies across the country have elicited similar comments.

Human Resource Investment Council

Many studies suggest that a state's ability to develop a highly skilled, productive, and educated workforce is closely related to its ability to integrate its employment, training and education programs into a comprehensive workforce development system that promotes life-long learning. Given research findings that the SJTCCs were not effectively fulfilling their policy leadership and coordination roles, in 1992 Congress debated requiring a single, integrated state policy council. The JTPA Amendments of 1992 provided for the optional formation of a Human Resource Investment Council (HRIC) to centralize workforce preparation planning and program oversight in each state. Congress considered mandating that each state create a HRIC but did not do so (California opposed the mandatory provision). The 1992 amendments instead authorized states to consolidate the numerous overlapping advisory councils and administrative bodies required by a range of federal human resource programs (see Table 4).

According to the National Governor's Association, the purpose of a HRIC is, " to provide coordination of federal human resource programs, to advise the Governor on human investment, and to recommend ways to meet those needs, while maximizing federal funds and avoiding duplication of effort."[9] The intent is to achieve better coordination at the state level and thereby improve services to workers and employers at the local level.

---

[6]Unemployment Insurance Code Section 15035.
[7]Young, Arthur. State Job Training Coordinating Council. Final Report on a Coordination Study of the SJTCC and JTPA. September 1, 1988.
[8]Ibid.
[9]National Governors' Association. Human Resource Investment Councils. 1994.

Table 4

Potential Human Resource Investment Council Programs

FEDERAL PROGRAMS	*CALIFORNIA ADMINISTERING AGENCIES*
• The Job Training Partnership Act	Employment Development Department SJTCC* for policy direction COICC* for occupational information
• The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act	State Department of Education California Community Colleges SCOVE* for policy direction
• The National and Community Service Act	California Conservation Corps
• The Adult Education Act	State Department of Education
• The Wagner-Peyser Act (employment service)	Employment Development Department
• The Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS)	Department of Social Services
• The Food Stamp Act Employment Program	Department of Social Services

*SJTCC - State Job Training Coordinating Council
*COICC - California Occupational Information Coordinating Committee
*SCOVE - State Council on Vocational Education
Source: California Research Bureau/California State Library

A HRIC exercises policy-setting responsibilities for all the programs under its purview. The specific responsibilities are detailed by the 1992 JTPA Amendments:

- Develop and review federally-mandated state employment and training plans;
- Establish budgetary priorities for a state employment and training system;
- Advise the Governor on the development, coordination, and implementation of state and local standards and performance measures;
- Carry out duties and functions prescribed for existing councils of federal programs;
- Identify the human investment needs in the state and recommend to the Governor goals for meeting such needs;
- Recommend how to develop and coordinate an education and employment system in the state;
- Prepare and recommend to the Governor a strategic plan to accomplish those goals; and
- Monitor the implementation of and evaluate the effectiveness of the strategic plan.

The 1992 JTPA amendments specify the membership of a Human Resources Investment Council. Table 5 compares the differences in membership between a SJTCC and a HRIC.

Table 5

Comparison of Council Membership

State Job Training Coordinating Council	State Human Resource Investment Council*
30% business & industry	at least 15 % from business & industry
30% organized labor and community based organizations	at least 15% from organized labor and community based organizations.
30% representatives from the legislature and state agencies	representatives from state legislatures, state agencies, local government and welfare agencies, and individuals with special expertise regarding hard-to-serve individuals
10% general public	at least 15% from each of the following: local public education, secondary institution, a secondary or post-secondary vocational and a community based organization.
	the head of each state agency responsible for the administration of an applicable federal human resource program

*Membership categories cannot represent more than 60 percent of the overall membership of the council.

Source: California Research Bureau/California State Library

Human Resource Investment Councils may be funded by money previously earmarked for other federally mandated state advisory councils and programs and may use personnel and facilities provided by pertinent state and local agencies. Most federal programs may be included when the Governor and the head of each state agency responsible for an applicable program jointly agree to do so. However, federal programs authorized under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act require the concurrence of the State Council on Vocational Education (SCOVE) to be included. The JTPA also provides an 8 percent set aside (Title IIA) for vocational education to promote coordinated programs and service delivery.

The requirement that SCOVE concur in any consolidation is a result of the separation between job training and vocational education programs and their administering federal agencies, the Departments of Labor and Education. Each department has a separate legislative mandate, defines and addresses workforce preparation differently, and has different stakeholders. For example, a National Alliance of Business study found that distinct missions impede coordination: JTPA measures job placement and cost-per-placement, while vocational education providers emphasize meeting a clients' developmental needs. Job training programs fall under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor (the Employment Development Department in

California). Vocational education programs are administered by the U.S. Department of Education (the Department of Education and Community Colleges in California).

Both JTPA and the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act require joint planning and information exchange between vocational education and job training programs. However consolidation under a "job training" governing structure may be controversial, particularly if a state's Superintendant of Public Instruction represents a different political party than the Governor. Bureaucratic consolidation and coordination are difficult to accomplish, given the turf issues they raise. Since SCOVE and the SJTCC become redundant when their functions are consolidated into a HRIC they have limited incentive to consolidate.

Super Councils

Several states began the process of linking human resource programs by creating "super councils" prior to the 1992 JTPA amendments. A super council is a state-designated council that has policy authority over human resource programs. The councils may be created by statute, executive order, or both. Council functions vary, but they primarily include strategic planning, state plan review, budget review, program evaluation and various line administrative responsibilities, as detailed in Table 6. Council membership and responsibilities also vary among the states (see Tables 7 and 8 below).

Super councils and Human Resource Investment Councils are very similar. Both have jurisdiction over combinations of the following programs: vocational education, secondary education, community colleges, higher education, employment and training, vocational rehabilitation, welfare-to-work, youth apprenticeship, adult education and literacy programs (see Table 9).

Table - 6

Human Resource Investment Councils and Super Council Structure and Authority

	STRUCTURE	HRIC	Super council	AUTHORIZATION	Statute	Executive Order	Both Legislation & Executive Order	Legislation Pending	AUTHORITY	Plan Review	Strategic Planning	Budget Review	Program Evaluation*
Connecticut: Connecticut Employment & Training Commission		x			x					x	x		x
Indiana: Indiana Human Resource Investment Council		x			x					x	x		x
Iowa: Iowa Workforce Development Council			x				x			x	x		x
Kentucky: Kentucky Workforce Alliance			x					x		x	x	x	x
Maine: Maine Human Resource Development Council			x				x			x	x	x	x
Maryland: Governor's Workforce Investment Board		x					x			x	x	x	x
Massachusetts: MASSJOBS Council		x					x			x	x	x	x
Michigan: Michigan Jobs Commission		x				x				x	x		x
Missouri: Missouri Training and Employment Council			x		x					x	x	x	x
New Jersey: New Jersey State Employment & Training Commission		x					x			x	x	x	x
North Carolina: Governor's Commision on Workforce Preparedness		x				x				x	x	x	x
Ohio: Governor's Human Resources Investment Council		x				x				x	x		x
Oregon: Oregon Workforce Quality Council		x			x					x	x	x	x
Rhode Island: Rhode Island Human Resource Investment Council		x			x					x	x		x
Texas: Texas Council on Workforce & Economic Competitiveness		x			x					x	x	x	x
Vermont: Human Resource Investment Council		x					x			x	x		x
Washington: Workforce Training & Education Coordinating Board			x		x					x	x	x	x
West Virgina: Governor's Work Force Development Council			x		x					x	x		x
Wisconsin: Wisconsin Jobs Council			x			x				x	x		x

* With the exceptions of Connecticut, Missouri, and Rhode Island, the states listed evaluate all programs.

Source: Jobs For The Future, May 1994./Updated data for Oregon

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table - 7

Human Resource Investment Council and Super Council Membership -State Government

	Dept. of Commerce	Dept. of Community Affairs	Dept. of Economic Affairs	Dept. of Economic Development	Dept. of Education	Dept. of Employment & Training	Dept. of Family & Juvenile Services	Dept. of Human Services & Welfare	Dept. of Labor	JOBS/Welfare Reform Advisory Board	State Advisory Council on Adult Education & Literacy	State Council on Vocational Education	State Job Service Employment Council	State Legislature	Additional Members
Connecticut: Connecticut Employment & Training Commission				x	x				x	x		x		x	x
Indiana: Indiana Human Resource Investment Council	x			x	x	x	x					x	x		
Iowa: Iowa Workforce Development Council				x	x	x		x							x
Kentucky: Kentucky Workforce Alliance				x	x	x			x	x	x	x			x
Maine: Maine Human Resource Development Council		x		x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x	x
Maryland: Governor's Workforce Investment Board				x		x	x	x		x		x			
Massachusetts: MASSJOBS Council			x		x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	
Michigan: Michigan Jobs Commission	x			x	x	x		x	x		x				x
Missouri: Missouri Training and Employment Council				x	x			x	x					x	
New Jersey: New Jersey State Employment & Training Commission	x	x			x			x	x		x	x	x	x	
North Carolina: Governor's Commision on Workforce Preparedness	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Ohio: Governor's Human Resources Investment Council				x	x	x		x		x	x			x	x
Oregon: Oregon Workforce Quality Council				x	x			x	x			x		x	
Rhode Island: Rhode Island Human Resource Investment Council				x	x	x		x		x		x	x	x	x
Texas: Texas Council on Workforce & Economic Competitiveness	x				x	x		x		x	x	x	x		x
Vermont: Human Resource Investment Council		x		x	x	x		x	x	x			x	x	
Washington: Workforce Training & Education Coordinating Board					x	x									x
West Virgina: Governor's Work Force Development Council				x	x	x		x		x		x			
Wisconsin: Wisconsin Jobs Council				x	x	x	x	x		x				x	x

Source : Jobs For The Future, May 1994.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table - 7 (cont'd)

Human Resource Investment Councils and Super Council - Membership Business, Education, Labor, Community

	Business	Local Public Education	Post-Secondary	Vocational Education	Labor	Community-based Organizations	Experts; Low income, Economic Development, Human Resource	General Public	Local Government	Local Programs (e.g., local PICS)
Connecticut: Connecticut Employment & Training Commission	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Indiana: Indiana Human Resource Investment Council	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x
Iowa: Iowa Workforce Development Council	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x
Kentucky: Kentucky Workforce Alliance	x		x		x					
Maine: Maine Human Resource Development Council	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		
Maryland: Governor's Workforce Investment Board	x	x	x		x	x				x
Massachusetts: MASSJOBS Council	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x
Michigan: Michigan Jobs Commission	x	x	x		x	x				
Missouri: Missouri Training and Employment Council	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	
New Jersey: New Jersey State Employment & Training Commission	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
North Caroline: Governor's Commision on Workforce Preparedness	x	x	x	x	x			x		x
Ohio: Governor's Human Resources Investment Council	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			
Oregon: Oregon Workforce Quality Council	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	
Rhode Island: Rhode Island Human Resource Investment Council	x		x		x	x		x		x
Texas: Texas Council on Workforce & Economic Competitiveness	x	x	x	x	x	x				
Vermont: Human Resource Investment Council	x		x		x		x			
Washington: Workforce Training & Education Coordinating Board	x		x		x					
West Virgina: Governor's Work Force Development Council	x	x	x	x	x					
Wisconsin: Wisconsin Jobs Council	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	

Source: Jobs For The Future, May 1994.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table - 8

Human Resource Investment Council and Super Council Responsibilities

	Agency Consolidation	Labor Market Analysis	Establish & Work with Local Labor Market Boards	Local Functions Mirror State HRIC's	Plan Approval	Service Delivery Area Restructuring	Automated Linking of Client Services	Creation of One-Stop Shops	Linkages with Local Economic Development	Promote High Performance Work Organization	School-to-Work	Skills Enhancement for Workforce Development Professionals
Connecticut: Connecticut Employment & Training Commission			x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x
Indiana: Indiana Human Resource Investment Council	x	x	x	x				x	x	x	x	X
Iowa: Iowa Workforce Development Council							x	x	x		x	
Kentucky: Kentucky Workforce Alliance			x	x	x						x	
Maine: Maine Human Resource Development Council		x			x			x	x		x	
Maryland: Governor's Workforce Investment Board					x	x		x		X	x	
Massachusetts: MASSJOBS Council		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
Michigan: Michigan Jobs Commission	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Missouri: Missouri Training and Employment Council		x				x		x	x	x	x	x
New Jersey: New Jersey State Employment & Training Commission	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x
North Caroline: Governor's Commision on Workforce Preparedness		x			x	x	x		x	x	x	x
Ohio: Governor's Human Resources Investment Council		x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Oregon: Oregon Workforce Quality Council			x	x	x	x			x	x	x	
Rhode Island: Rhode Island Human Resource Investment Council		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Texas: Texas Council on Workforce & Economic Competitiveness	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
Vermont: Human Resource Investment Council							x	x			x	
Washington: Workforce Training & Education Coordinating Board					x		x	x	x	x	x	x
West Virgina: Governor's Work Force Development Council		x						x	x		x	x
Wisconsin: Wisconsin Jobs Council					x	x	x	x			x	

Source: Jobs For The Future, May 1994.

Table - 9

Human Resource Investment Councils and Super Council Programs

	Adult Education	Food Stamps Employment & Training Program	JOBS	JTPA- Training	National & Community Service	Carl D. Perkins	Special State Programs	State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee	Wagner-Peyser
Connecticut: Connecticut Employment & Training Commission	x		x	x		x		x	x
Indiana: Indiana Human Resource Investment Council	x	x	x	x		x			x
Iowa: Iowa Workforce Development Council	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Kentucky: Kentucky Workforce Alliance	x		x	x		x	x		x
Maine: Maine Human Resource Development Council	x		x	x		x			
Maryland: Governor's Workforce Investment Board	x		x	x		x			x
Massachusetts: MASSJOBS Council	x		x	x	x	x	x		x
Michigan: Michigan Jobs Commission		x	x	x	x			x	x
Missouri: Missouri Training and Employment Council	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
New Jersey: New Jersey State Employment & Training Commission									
North Carolina: Governor's Commision on Workforce Preparedness	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
Ohio: Governor's Human Resources Investment Council	x	x	x	x			x		x
Oregon: Oregon Workforce Quality Council	x		x	x		x	x	x	x
Rhode Island: Rhode Island Human Resource Investment Council	x			x	x	x	x		x
Texas: Texas Council on Workforce & Economic Competitiveness	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Vermont: Human Resource Investment Council									
Washington: Workforce Training & Education Coordinating Board	x			x		x			
West Virgina: Governor's Work Force Development Council	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
Wisconsin: Wisconsin Jobs Council	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x

Source: Jobs For The Future, May 1994.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Local Service Integration

Some states have a corollary effort underway to integrate local workforce preparation planning activities and programs. Local councils or boards are usually responsible for developing a unified regional plan and coordinating and evaluating service delivery.[10] For example, Oregon has established 15 Regional Workforce Quality Committees as subcommittees of the State Workforce Quality Council. These committees are responsible for the design and implementation of regional strategic plans that complement state policy and promote local collaboration and coordinated service delivery. They also have a major role in the creation, design and administration of Oregon's One Stop Career System and its School-to-Work program. The goal is to ensure that the services are consistent with the unique needs of each region.

California has a history of granting local agencies greater program control in other policy areas. For example, in FY 1991-92, the Governor transferred responsibility for community-based mental health programs and the county indigent and public health service programs from the state to the counties as part of a state-county "realignment." The legislation provided counties more flexibility to use funds for support services for county patients. Services could be provided through the state hospitals, Institutions for Mental Diseases, and community-based programs. The effect of the changes was to provide counties with the authority to make resource allocation decisions regarding mental health services based on their assessment of program effectiveness.[11] The realignment legislation appears to be a success due to the following factors:

- It placed greater responsibility for resource allocation decisions at the county level;
- It removed many barriers to innovation and efficiency, such as allowing counties to "buy" more community mental health services and fewer state hospital services; and
- It focused on outcome measures, leading to performance-based contracts.

Council Outcomes

States that have opted to form super councils or a HRIC claim that the goal of an integrated workforce preparation system is directly linked to improvements in service delivery, quality, and cost effectiveness. At this time, since most councils are relatively new, these outcomes remain informed speculation. However, states expect councils to generate improvements in the following areas:

- Greater efficiency and improved performance by reducing administrative and programmatic duplication.
- Streamlined oversight and planning functions.
- Centralized responsibility and accountability.
- Rapid response to changing economic, demographic and technological circumstances.
- Enhanced response to federal block granting of human resource program funds.

---

[10]Ganglass, Evelyn, ed., Excellence at Work: Policy Option Papers. Washington, D. C.: National Governors' Association, 1992

[11]Hill, Elizabeth G. The 1991-92 State and Local Program Realignment, Overview and Current Issues. February 1992.

- Improved links between workforce development programs and economic development efforts.

For example, Oregon's Workforce Quality Council is developing one-stop shops for job training and employment services, creating benchmarks and performance measures, directing and monitoring a School-to-Work program, and bringing together the education and business communities to create business internships for teachers (see a more detailed discussion below). The Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness is responsible for restructuring state and local programs, strategic planning, creating a "one-stop shop" services plan, and developing school-to-work programs. Texas also recently approved legislation to consolidate over 20 employment and training programs into one agency. Michigan and Massachusetts require their councils to create linkages with local economic development efforts.

New federal initiatives, such as one-stop career centers and school-to-work, offer important planning and pilot project grant funding opportunities to the states. Many states are using their councils to develop funding proposals. States with a unified planning structure were among the first to receive school-to-work implementation funding: Kentucky, Maine, Massachussetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, and Wisconsin.[12] In contrast, states without a unified council planning structure have taken much longer to develop their proposals, in part due to duplication of effort and overlapping responsibilities. For example, California's School-to-Career State Implementation Plan was submitted in June of 1995, and was recently denied program funding, although an additional planning grant is likely. Since federal funding is already authorized, the state will probably receive from $75 to $100 million over a 5 year period for the program once it has an approved plan.[13]

The effectiveness of a super council or HRIC can be limited if key constituencies remain outside its purview, particularly the vocational education community. In addition, some program staff in California are concerned that creating a council with multiple program oversight responsibilities may make it difficult for council members to focus on any one program and thereby reduce specialized effectiveness. Futhermore as long as federal funding streams remain separated, regulations and program requirements will be difficult to blend.

SELECTED STATE COMPARISONS

Oregon

Oregon created the Oregon Workforce Quality Council in 1991 to oversee and coordinate state and federal workforce development programs. The council assumed the functions of the State Job Training Coordinating Council, the Oregon Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, and the Oregon Council for Professional Technical Education. In 1994 the council

---

[12]8 states have received federal funding to implement School to Work at this time.

[13]Recent indications are that California may not receive funding this year, pending additional negotiations.

became a "HRIC" for federal JTPA purposes when the Food Stamp Employment and Training program and the National and Community Services program were included in its jurisdiction.

Mission and Composition of the Oregon Workforce Quality Council

The Oregon Workforce Quality Council is responsible for the development and implementation of workforce development strategies broadly defined to include education, job training and economic development. The council is charged with developing a strategic state workforce development plan and restructuring local service delivery areas. One of its first tasks was to bring together government, business and labor leaders to work on school reform and workforce development issues.

The council's statewide workforce plan stresses the importance of integrating public resources and services, and proposes consolidating the administrative structures of over 40 workforce development programs. However, this recommendation has not been implemented due to turf issues among the various administrative agencies.

The council is composed of 21 members appointed by the Governor from business, labor, government, education, the legislature and the public. The Governor also serves as a member. The following state agencies are included: Economic Development Department, Education Department, Department of Human Resources, Bureau of Labor and Industries, Community College Services, and the State System of Higher Education.

Responsibilities

Performance Measures

In 1989 the State Legislature created the Oregon Progress Board to implement a 20 year strategic plan, with creating a "world class" workforce by the year 2010 as one of three key goals. The Progress Board has created 259 benchmarks to measure Oregon's progress towards achieving those goals. The benchmarks are updated every two years and used by state and local governments to re-assess and re-prioritize budget and program priorities.

The benchmarks are grouped into "lead" benchmarks and "key" benchmarks. Key or core benchmarks establish long-term goals that define "vitality and health," qualities which Oregonians seek in life. A typical measurement is the percentage of children living above poverty. The current year's measure is displayed next to historical performance data and a long term target (in this instance, 100 percent above poverty by the year 2010). Lead or urgent benchmarks identify issues that need to be addressed in the next few years. The 1994 Governor's long-range strategic plan for state economic development[14] identifies many priority benchmarks, including:

- Job skill preparation (measured by the percentage of high school students with significant involvement in professional technical programs); and

---

[14]Oregon Progress Board. Oregon Benchmarks. Standards for Measuring Statewide Progress and Institutional Performance. December 1994.

- Workforce adaptability (measured by the percentage of displaced workers reemployed within 24 months and earning at least 90 percent of their previous income).

Other examples of workforce benchmarks include:

- High school graduation rate;
- Percentage of students who attain a skills Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM)[15];
- Percentage of adults (25 and older) with an associate degree, certificate of completion or journeyman card;
- Employment in historically under-represented occupations (e.g., management, professions and technical occupations) by African Americans, American Indians, Asians, Hispanics, women, and persons with disabilities;
- Percentage of employers sponsoring School-to-Work activities; and
- Percentage of public education and training agencies, independent schools and colleges that are high performance work organizations[16] and use results-oriented performance measures.

The Oregon Workforce Quality Council has established workforce system performance measures in order to review progress towards meeting benchmark goals. Typical measures include wage at job placement and the following 8 quarters, the unit cost per person who gets a job, and the number of clients who remain employed after job placement. The measurements will assist the council in developing performance-based contracts.

The council is also developing the Shared Information System (SIS) to consolidate statewide workforce development information. Currently each agency has its own data base; there is no means of comparing data across programs. The objective of the SIS system is to link data bases and develop standardized information across programs. The system will use social security numbers to track clients. This will be accomplished by providing disclosure information to the client and requesting permission (a signed release form) to use the information. Once underway the SIS will measure the impact of workforce preparation programs on Oregon's workforce and will serve as an important tool to evaluate short-term program success. An Occupational Program Planning System will also be used for forecasting, planning and as a performance measurement tool.

The Oregon Workforce Option

The goal of the Oregon Workforce Option is to eliminate the many federal regulatory and reporting barriers which impede efficient and effective delivery of workforce development services. The state is negotiating with the Clinton Administration to block grant federal funds which flow through the Departments of Labor, Education and Health and Human Services. The funds would flow with significant waivers of federal regulations, in exchange for the delivery of mutually agreed upon outcomes. The federal School-to-Work Opportunities Act and Goals 2000:

---

[15]Certificates of Advanced Mastery are awarded to students who meet high-performance outcome standards that emphasize the application of knowledge and skills in varied, realistic environments.

[16]High performance work organizations provide workers with the information, skills, incentives and responsibility to make decisions essential for innovation, quality improvement, and rapid response to change.

Educate America Act already allows waiver authority for demonstration projects. In addition, a pending appropriation bill and SB 1120 (Dole) broaden the authority of the Departments of Labor and Health and Human Services to grant broad program waivers to states.

Oregon has agreed to specific performance measures for the following workforce development programs: Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (GAIN in California), Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990, Wagner-Peyser (Worker Profiling) and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act. In return the federal government will reduce the rules and regulations associated with those programs and will work with the state to achieve the agreed upon performance measures. Oregon has requested waivers in the following areas: reporting and management information systems, planning, procurement, cost allocation, eligibility requirements and child labor laws.

Oregon is uniquely able to take advantage of federal waivers due to its Benchmarks program. The state and many local governments have already begun using an outcome or performance-based model to establish long-range goals, set public priorities, allocate resources, design services, and measure results.

Education Reform

One of the Workforce Quality Council's principal goals is to foster primary and secondary school reform. Primary school reform efforts focus on revising curriculum and standards to enable students to achieve a higher level of basic competency in science, math and language arts. Primary and secondary education programs will be designed to enable students to achieve "Certificates of Initial Mastery" by 16 years of age which certify proficiency in science, language and math. Students who have difficulty in school will be offered alternative learning programs. Certificates of Advanced Mastery (CAM) will be awarded to students who meet high-performance outcome standards that emphasize the application of knowledge and skills in varied, realistic environments.[17]

The Council is also responsible for overseeing the development of comprehensive professional and technical education programs. The goal is to provide training in occupations that lead to employment in the state. Performance standards are being developed with and approved by business and industry. Curricula include work experience and on-the-job training.

Youth Apprenticeship

Oregon's Youth Apprenticeship Program is a component of a broad partnership effort between government, education and industry to enhance a student's transition from high school to employment, registered adult apprenticeship programs or higher education. Youth apprenticeship combines classroom learning with on-the-job, structured, paid work experience. Youth apprenticeship programs also include career exploration courses and regular high school classes. The program is open to 16 and 17 year old students who are enrolled in professional or technical

[17]Oregon Department of Education. Toward Implementation of the Oregon Educational Act of the 21st Century. Working Designs for Change. January, 1993.

programs, who maintain certain academic standards, and who have demonstrated competency in a career experience program. Youth apprentices may be employed only by employers who have been approved as apprenticeship training agents, provide workers' compensation insurance and comply with all applicable labor laws and guidelines.

Regional Workforce Quality Committees

The 1991 Oregon Workforce Quality Act established 15 Regional Work Force Quality Committees as subcommittees of the state Workforce Quality Council. Their charge is to design and implement regional strategic plans that complement state policy and promote collaboration, communication, and coordination of planning and service delivery at the local level. The committees are also responsible for preparing, reviewing and monitoring the budgets and finances of all local workforce programs, overseeing implementation of the state's workforce strategic plan, gathering performance data, providing policy guidance, facilitating coordination, identifying methods to maximize resources, and ensuring equitable access to services

The regional committees have a central role in the creation, design and administration of Oregon's One Stop Career Center System. (The State Council has initiated a project, Leadership for Change, to assist in this transition.) Oregon's School-to-Work system will also be designed, managed and funded through Regional Workforce Quality Committees. In many communities the committees have become the focal point for coordinating business involvement in education reform.

Throughout 1992 and early 1993, the fifteen Regional Workforce Quality Committees assessed the workforce needs in their regions. The data formed the basis for Regional Workforce Strategic Plans, which were submitted to the State Workforce Quality Council for review and approval. Local involvement was instrumental in the approval of the plans. Partners in the colloborative effort included job training stakeholders, employer groups, community colleges, and local school boards. Each community used a slightly different approach to colloboration. Some regional committees incorporated all stakeholders as committee members and others appointed them to subcommittees.

The regional systems are still evolving. Some regions are developing a single plan integrating resources and services from School-to-Work, Carl Perkins Vocational Education and JTPA ("8 percent" coordination set aside). Committees are establishing service delivery agreements with regional service providers to coordinate employment training, education and job placement services. These agreements incorporate local goals of reducing duplication of effort, equitably distributing services, and maximizing efficiency and effectiveness. Local strategic plans are based on Workforce Performance Measures which support Oregon's Benchmarks and facilitate performance evaluation of programs and service providers.

Massachusetts

Three separate studies conducted by Massachusetts' state officials, legislators, and local employment and training practitioners in the 1980's all recommended streamlining the state's 40 different job training programs. The principal finding was that, "in the absence of a strong coordinating body, little effort was being made to ensure that these individual programs were pursuing compatible policy goals or delivering services in an integrated fashion."[18]

In 1988, Massachusetts became one of the first states in the nation to establish a super council, the MassJobs Council (MJC), to oversee its entire workforce development system. This super-council was given responsibility for setting policy and providing oversight for 40 employment and training programs including, but not limited to, Job Training Partnership Act programs, employment service programs under the federal Wagner-Peyser Act, adult basic education programs, employment-related secondary education programs, state-sponsored technical skills training programs, employment-related community college programs, vocational educational programs, and other training, employment-related education, and placement programs serving youth and targeted adult groups.

An important initial obstacle faced by the council was that each program operated separately and often in competition with each other. In 1991, in an effort to create a cohesive system, additional legislation was enacted designating the council as the Governor's principal advisory board for workforce development policy. In 1993 the Council was declared a Human Resource Investment Council by Governor Weld.

Mission of the MassJobs Council

The Council's mission is to build a workforce development system at the state and local level which includes business and industry as principal customers and partners. The Council provides broad policy-making and oversight responsibilities for all federal and state funded workforce development programs in Massachusetts. Local coordination of service delivery is overseen by 16 Regional Employment Boards.

The Council contends that in order to transform the state's job training and employment-related education efforts into a well-coordinated, market-based workforce development system the following goals are essential:

- Emphasize a demand or customer-driven perspective, not a supply or program-driven perspective. Customers (both businesses and individuals) should identify their own needs and have access to the most appropriate training or education supplier.

- Ensure that services are readily understandable and easy to use, enabling any individual or business to find information about the full array of services available and the most suitable providers.

---

[18]MassJobs Council. Annual Report to the Governor and the Legislature. July 1993, to June 30, 1994.

- Focus on outcomes and performance, allocating resources on the basis of the value added (such as meaningful learning gains or placement in high-wage jobs).

- Be administered locally but centrally guided. Guidance at the state level is necessary to establish a single, consistent set of objectives. However, since services are delivered at the local level, it is essential that administrative coordination take place at this level.[19]

Composition and Responsibilities of the MassJobs Council

The Council is composed of 31 members appointed by the Governor for 3 year terms. Thirteen members are appointed from organized labor, business and industry, state and local government, service providers, client groups, Regional Employment Boards, and community based organizations. State government members administer education, labor, and human service programs and include university and legislative leaders.

The Council's activities include establishing common program standards and objectives, reviewing and approving service plans and grant applications, and promoting working partnerships with private employers and client groups in the development, design, and funding of training, employment, and employment-related educational programs. The Council focuses on four primary areas:

- Linking workforce development to economic development;
- Mobilizing the private sector to act as a partner;
- Integrating the state and local delivery system, and
- Serving as an impartial policy broker.

Regional Employment Boards

Massachusetts was the first state to create local super councils with broad authority over local workforce development programs. Legislation enacted in 1988 reduced the number of local JTPA Service Delivery Areas and Private Industry Councils (PICs). (PICs are public/private boards which determine policy for JTPA Service Delivery Areas and sometimes administer service delivery.) The PICs were reconstituted as 16 consolidated Regional Employment Boards. The concept is that "...each community knows best the issues and problems facing their region and they are in the best position to find the right solutions. Our job at the state level must be to steer, not to row..."[20]

---

[19]MassJobs Council. Annual Report to the Governor and the Legislature. July 1, 1992 to June 30, 1993.
[20]MassJobs Council. Annual Report to the Governor and the Legislature. September 1993.

The MassJob Council has developed the following goals for Regional Employment Boards:

- Develop a vision or mission statement which establishes a policy framework, and a strategic plan which includes both short-term (one year) and long-term (three year) goals for executing the vision statement.

- Develop an oversight strategy to measure the performance of service providers in the region. Projects like the Placement Accountability System are designed to analyze the long term earnings impact of various state service interventions.

- Become the link between employers and job seekers in the region and be objective in the distribution of funds to training providers.

- Be visible in the region, communicate with program customers and key elected officials, and have a diverse membership that includes important business, economic and workforce development decision makers.[21]

Each REB engages in strategic planning by first identifying the industries which are most important to regional economic competitiveness and then surveying their training needs. The REB then develops action projects which build direct linkages between local employment and training services and industry. For example, the MassJobs Council, a Regional Employment Board and the Massachusetts Office of Business Development jointly identified multiple funding sources to assist a key company in upgrading the workforce skills of a recently acquired company. As a result, the company decided to remain in Massachusetts.

Regional Employment Boards are also involved in convening members of the private sector, educators, community-based organizations, and labor representatives to develop plans for creating regional school-to-work systems. The REBs initially identify existing career and vocational programs and organize their leaders to share their expertise. The goal is to expand and enhance individual programs and build a school-to-work system that responds to the regional and local economies and reflects the innovation and leadership of the local partners.[22]

Regional Economic Development Projects

In 1993, Massachusetts launched "Choosing to Compete," a strategy that emphasizes regional approaches to economic development. Since that time, 11 REB Action Projects have been funded which link local workforce development and economic development activities. REBs have taken the lead in bringing together state agencies to examine options for consolidating, coordinating, and integrating regional services to be more accessible to customers. For example, the REBs are working with the Massachusetts Office of Business Development to develop "one-stop" centers.[23]

---

[21]MassJobs Council. Annual Report to the Governor and the Legislature. September 1993.
[22]MassJobs Council. Annual Report to the Governor and the Legislature. September 1994.
[23]Ibid.

As of June 1994, the MassJobs Council had funded industrial cluster projects in industries identified by the Regional Employment Boards as essential to regional economic development. The projects link economic development agencies with workforce skills enhancement agencies. The goal is to assist companies to start-up, expand, or relocate, and to ensure that a pool of skilled workers is available. Industrial clusters serve as an organizing concept by which to organize firms and to provide work-based learning activities on a significant scale.

The industrial cluster projects are:

- Biotechnology
- Machining/Metalworking
- Plastics
- Hospitals/Allied Health
- Tourism
- Environmental
- Telecommunication
- Textiles and apparel[24]

Texas

Texas also responded to studies recommending that the state establish a Human Resource Investment Council (HRIC). The Governor issued an Executive Order creating a task force to develop an action plan. The task force was given six weeks to formulate and agree upon a plan to establish a council, coordinate the use of applicable program funds, and integrate program services. This plan was subsequently proposed in legislation and enacted in 1993, creating the Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness. The Council's purpose is to "advise the Governor regarding policies, goals, and standards for the effective use of the state's resources devoted to improving the education and skills of the workforce."[25] The Council is also responsible for establishing local workforce development boards to plan and oversee local workforce development programs.

Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness

The mission of the Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness is to create a world-class, customer-driven workforce development system capable of providing Texas' citizens with the skills necessary to perform expertly in high performance work organizations which are competitive in the global economy.[26] The Council consists of 42 members (35 voting, 7 non-voting), 30 of whom are appointed by the Governor, including representatives from the private sector, labor, education, community-based organizations, and eight state agencies. The Council replaced five existing state advisory committees and councils:

- State Job Training Coordinating Council;
- Texas Council on Vocational Education;

---

[24]Ibid.

[25]The Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness. Application for Local Workforce Development Board Certification. May 1995.

[26]Governor's Task Force on Education and Economic Competitiveness. Proposal for the Creation of the Work Force and Economic Competitiveness Council. April, 1993.

- Technical Advisory Committee to the State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee;
- Texas Literacy Council; and
- Apprenticeship and Training Advisory Committee.

Council Responsibilities

The Council's principal responsibilities are similar to those in other states:

- Design a single strategic plan for the state's workforce development programs.
- Develop a statewide labor market information system.
- Create a common client application process.
- Design and recommend state/local program consolidation.
- Develop a statewide evaluation and participant follow-up system.
- Advocate and promote for an integrated service delivery system.

One of the Council's first projects was to develop a statewide workforce preparation plan, including recommendations to consolidate all workforce development programs in the state. The Council recommended the establishment of a Texas Workforce Commission.

In June 1995, the Governor signed HB 1863, which consolidates welfare reform and workforce development programs. The legislation establishes the Texas Workforce Commission to administer an integrated workforce development system. This new agency will consolidate the functions of 24 existing state job training and employment-related programs (see Table 10 below) and administer the state's unemployment compensation program.

Texas Workforce Commission

The Texas Workforce Commission began operation on September 1, 1995. Some of its key responsibilities include:

- Consolidate the administrative and programmatic functions of the 24 separate state and federal programs listed in Table 10.
- Implement workforce training policies and programs consistent with recommendations from the Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness as approved by the Governor.
- Serve as an advocate for the design of local workforce development boards.
- Administer a statewide comprehensive labor market information system.

Table 10

The Texas Workforce Commission
Consolidated Programs

- Proprietary School Program
- Adult Education -has since been returned to the Texas Education Agency
- Apprenticeship Programs
- Postsecondary vocational and technical job training programs that are not part of programs that lead to licensing, certification, or an associate degree
- Employment Programs
- Senior Citizens Employment Program
- Work and Family Policies Program
- Job Training Partnership Act - JTPA
- Job Counseling Program for Displaced Homemakers
- Communities in Schools Program
- Reintegration of Offenders Program
- Inmate Employment Counseling Program
- Community Service Program under the National and Community Service Act of 1990
- Trade Adjustment Assistance Program
- Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Program (JOBS)
- Food Stamp Employment and Training Program
- Functions of the State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee
- Programs to enhance the employment opportunities of veterans
- Child-care services
- Programs established with federal funding for full service career development centers and school-to-work transition services
- Programs funded under Section 123 of JTPA (education coordination funds).
- Continuity of Care Program
- Literacy Program
- Employment Programs

Source: Conference Committee Report on AB 1863

Local Workforce Development Boards

The Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness is responsible for developing a system of local workforce development boards to plan and oversee local programs. Local Workforce Development Boards replace the following federal and state-mandated councils: Private Industry Councils (JTPA); Quality Workforce Planning Committees (State); Job Service Employer Committees (Wagner-Peyser); and Vocational Advisory Committees (Carl D. Perkins).

The goal is for all workforce development programs to operate under a single state strategic plan and unified operational system while regionally implementing local plans for integrated services.

Local officials were initially given the option as to whether or not to create a local board. This option proved counterproductive and generated numerous turf battles, creating barriers to effective collaboration. An incentive approach was tried next, providing additional funding for Private Industry Councils which reorganize as a Local Workforce Development Boards. This new strategy appears to be working. Five Local Workforce Development Boards have been certified and have received planning grants, 2 more are in the process of submitting requests for certification, and other local areas are moving in the direction of forming local boards.

Federal policy changes also provide incentives for local collaboration. Since workforce program block granting at the federal level appears likely, establishing local boards may be a vehicle by which local agencies can apply for and receive federal block grant funding. State enabling legislation requires local agreement in order for local service providers to receive federal block grant funding.

Local Workforce Development Boards serve as the JTPA Private Industry Councils and are directly responsible for the operational planning and administration of all local workforce training and services funded through the Texas Workforce Commission. Local plans must be certified and approved by the Governor in order for the local boards to receive block grant funds from the state.

Local boards are required to establish workforce development centers within 180 days after being certified by the Governor. The centers are to provide the following services: labor market information, intake and eligibility determination, independent assessment of individual needs, case management, supportive services and referral of clients to appropriate education and training services. The practical effect is to create local one-stop shops for job training, vocational education, and job search services and unemployment insurance services.

Michigan

Michigan Jobs Commission

The Michigan Jobs Commission, created by Executive Order in 1993, is a cabinet level agency that consolidates 7 state agencies under one unified administration: Education, Labor, Commerce, the Employment Security Commission, Corrections, Social Services and Natural Resources. The Commission's mission is to coordinate the state's economic development and workforce development programs.

The Commission oversees the Office of Workforce Development and the Office of Economic Retention and Expansion. The Office of Workforce Development is responsible for consolidating job training programs, approving federal job training plans, and advising the state on overall workforce development strategies. Table 11 below lists the state and federal programs

administered by the Office of Workforce Development The Office of Economic Retention and Expansion focuses on improving relations with the business sector through an aggressive and proactive business retention program which contacts businesses throughout the state.

Table 11

Funding and Programs Transferred to the Michigan Jobs Commission, Office of Workforce Development

Job Training Partnership Act (Labor)	Michigan Occupational Information Coordination Committee (Labor)
Head Start Initiative (Labor)	EDGE and MOST Programs (Social Services/Education)
Displaced Homemaker Program (Labor)	Michigan Training Incentive Fund (Commerce)
Community Service Block Grant (Labor)	Job Training Components of Probation and Parolee Services (Corrections)
State Supplemental Assistance (Labor)	Michigan Council on Vocational Education (Education)
Weatherization Program (Labor)	Economic Development Job Training (Education)
Michigan Community Service Commission (Labor)	Youth Environmental Education Service Corps
Michigan Occupational Information System (Education)	

Source: Michigan Jobs Team

Michigan's Workforce Commission

The 1993 Governor's Executive Order which created the Michigan Jobs Commission also established an administrative arm, the Governor's Workforce Commission. The Workforce Commission is responsible for approving federal job training plans and advising the state on overall workforce development strategies. The commission has twenty members that serve a two year term.

The commission's primary function is to plan for and coordinate state and local service delivery. This includes developing a coordination and special services plan, assessing existing program services, reviewing programs for accountability, and recommending improvements. Key responsibilities include: developing common definitions, basic measurements and assessments; co-locating local service delivery providers; and increasing the usefulness of labor market information. In addition, the commission advises the Governor and the Michigan Jobs Commission on the designation of regional service delivery areas and funding methods.

CALIFORNIA

California has at least 10 state advisory bodies for its 22 human resource programs (see Table 1, page 3, for a program list). Those advisory boards include:

- The State Job Training Coordinating Council;
- The California Occupational Information Coordinating Council;
- The State Council on Vocational Education;
- The State Advisory Council on Refugee Assistance and Services;
- The California Postsecondary Education Commission;
- The Commission on Aging;
- The Employment Training Panel;
- The California Apprenticeship Council;
- The State Board of Education; and
- The Board of Governors, California Community Colleges.

There is limited formal coordination and consultation among advisory boards. The U.S. Department of Labor requires the state to submit a plan every two years detailing how it proposes to coordinate employment and training activities in the state. The State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC) prepares and submits the Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan, which is the state's strategic plan for employment and training programs and vocational education. The 1994-1995 Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan states: "It is the basic goal of the State of California that all employment, training and education programs be coordinated fully and non-duplicative. It is a further goal that these programs, to the degree possible, integrate resources and jointly plan common systems for the provision of services to meet the diverse needs of the eligible population and the unemployed."[27] However, the plan does not contain any specific mechanisms, requirements or targets by which to implement these goals. Thus the plan's general goals have minimal practical impact on program administration.

Local JTPA Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) and their governing Private Industry Councils (PICs) contend that the state's plan is not compatible with and has little influence on their local strategic program planning processes. Major concerns include the quality of the state council's policy guidance, insufficient local participation, inadequate coordination and consultation with other programs (such as GAIN) and timeliness. Local suggestions for improvement include:

- The state plan vision and mission should be clear and provide a broad policy direction;
- The plan should focus on desired outcomes instead of program compliance; and
- The plan should develop standardized definitions for all employment and training programs.[28]

The State Council on Vocational Education (SCOVE) also produces an independent state plan, as required by the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990. This

---

[27]SJTCC. Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan. April 29, 1994.
[28]State Job Training Coordinating Council. Minutes of a Joint Meeting of the Coordination and Linkages Committee and the JTPA Oversight Committee. September 13, 1994.

duplication of state plans, and confusion regarding their relationship, leads to ineffective statewide coordination and planning. For example, in March 1993, SCOVE and SJTCC attempted to jointly contract for a study to examine the adequacy, effectiveness, and levels of coordination and cooperation among California's vocational and job training programs. The two organizations were unable to agree on the terms of the contract and SCOVE ultimately continued the research effort on its own behalf. Table 12 presents some of the study's major recommendations.

Table 12

SCOVE Recommendations for Improved Job Training Program Delivery in California

- Minimize turf issues and improve coordination by combining multiple state oversight groups, thereby promoting common policies and the coordinated delivery of job training services and programs.
- Allow for more local control of funding, program design, and criteria.
- Implement federal and/or state mandates that would require vocational education agencies to coordinate their services with local JTPA Service Delivery Areas (SDAs), including appointing SDA staff to vocational education committees and Regional Occupation Center Program oversight groups, and requiring regular joint meetings.
- Mandate coordinated activities between the Employment Development Department and the State Job Training Coordinating Council, the California Department of Education, the California Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, and the State Council on Vocational Education, particularly for funding, program planning, information sharing, evaluation, and service delivery.
- Create a statewide data base that all job training agencies can access in order to share client information, track participants and program outcomes, and encourage cross referrals.
- Establish mandated joint staff training sessions between state agencies and between local SDA and vocational education staff.

Source: *The 1993 Biennial Report. The Coordination of Job Training.* State Council on Vocational Education, 1993.

Encouraging labor, employment and vocational education stakeholders to work together can pose a particular challenge in states that have an elected Superintendent of Public Instruction, such as California, particularly if the Governor is of a different political party. Typically in those states SCOVE is not receptive to the formation of a unified council, perhaps due to concerns that the vocational education community will not be adequately represented. On the other hand, a SCOVE may take the lead in order to strategically plan for and manage the change (as in Indiana and North Carolina, for example).

In California SCOVE supports the formation of a new independent advisory coordinating council. SCOVE proposed the following two options at a Senate hearing earlier this year:

- Establish a new independent advisory coordinating council that would report directly to the Governor. The existing advisory councils would eventually be phased out or consolidated, depending on the new council's recommendations.
- Create a super council with authority over the existing councils, which would report directly to it.

A 1988 study commissioned by the State Job Training Coordinating Council recommended that "the Council should seek to have one policy body designated for all employment training and job placement programs in California."[29] The study concluded that a single policy body offers the most effective means of integrating California's scattered job training and employment programs (see Table 1, page 3, for a list of programs and page 33 for a list of advisory councils). The study also noted that political realities had previously prevented the creation of a single state policy board for job training.

In 1992, California opposed Congressional language requiring a mandatory state Human Resource Investment Council. In March 1993, the State Job Training Coordinating Council considered a policy item to evaluate the formation of a Human Resource Investment Council (HRIC). The Council's agenda gave the following two reasons for not forming a HRIC:

- Creating a new council with such a large "umbrella" oversight would make it difficult for that body to focus on any one program; and
- The State Council on Vocational Education might decide that the Carl D. Perkins Act programs under its purview would not participate, thereby limiting the effectiveness of a Human Resources Investment Council.

California's multitude of advisory councils, administrative bodies and separate initiatives are confusing to administrators as well as clients. For example, the State Council on Vocational Education prepared comments and recommendations as part of a state response to federal vocational education legislation. Yet California's School-to-Career Plan, which was recently submitted to the federal government, did not incorporate the SCOVE recommendations. The reasons for this lack of policy coordination are unclear. The lack of statewide strategic planning may be one reason why California's School-to-Career grant proposal was recently returned by the Department of Labor. In contrast, the first 8 states to receive School-to-Career grant funding had an integrated policy and planning structure in place.

In 1994, Senator Johnston authored SB 1417 (Chapter 819, Statutes of 1994), requiring the State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC) to submit to the Legislature and the Governor an assessment of the state's existing employment and training programs. The council's report was to contain recommendations on the appropriate organizational structure for a statewide workforce

---

[29]Young, Arthur, Training Research Corporation. State Job Training Coordinating Council. Final Report on a Coordination Study of the SJTCC and JTPA. September 1, 1988.

preparation council, including its scope, mission, governance, and composition. The legislation required the SJTCC to begin a planning process to create an integrated employment and training system. However the mandated April 1995, SJTCC report did not make specific governance recommendations. Instead the Council deferred making recommendations on a new governing structure until April 1, 1996. In the meantime, the Council recommended that California's existing multiple advisory/governing bodies continue in their current form. The Council based its decision on two factors: a lack of consensus about which programs to include in the new organizational structure, and pending federal legislation that might block grant many human resource development programs, including job training, to the states.

In the course of its deliberations on the issues raised by SB 1417, the SJTCC held five public hearings around the state and took testimony from a number of individuals and organizations. The Council also formed an Interdepartmental Work Group composed of representatives from the California Department of Education, the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, the State Council on Vocational Education, the Department of Social Services, the Employment Development Department, the Department of Rehabilitation, the California State University, the University of California, the Employment Training Panel, and the California Trade and Commerce Agency. Representatives from each of these organizations were invited to attend the hearings. The following discussion summarizes the principal issues raised by the individuals and organizations who testified at the hearings.

SB 1417 Testimony--Issues

Testimony provided at the SB 1417 hearings reveals significant concerns and frustrations with the structure of California's workforce preparation programs, which are fragmented into 22 administrative units located in 13 state agencies (see Table 1, page 3, for a complete list). Duplication at the federal, state and local service delivery levels creates confusion and overlap in program administration, the types of services offered, and the clientele served (see Tables 2 and 3). Many individual and community education and job training needs are not being met at all, while existing programs are of variable quality. Lack of consistency results in incompatible rules and regulations, inadequate or nonexistent performance measures, narrow eligibility criteria, inefficient and duplicative provision of services, and competing public and private interests.

The following discussion summarizes testimony on the following key issues: service integration, strategic planning, administrative unification, performance accountability, one stop service delivery, private sector involvement, common eligibility criteria, and local control.

Service Integration

The consensus is that there are too many employment and training programs that provide the same services to overlapping clientele. A United States General Accounting Office (GAO) report, "Multiple Employment Training Programs," found that a number of federal employment and training programs offer the same services to the same population. For example, JTPA Title II-A (adult), Job Opportunities and Basic Skill (GAIN in California), the Food Stamp Employment and Training Program, and Carl D. Perkins adult education programs all provide skills assessment,

basic skills and vocational training, and job placement to the economically disadvantaged.[30] Duplication at the federal level is carried down to the state and local level. The result is confusion to the employer and the employee, making it difficult to identify where individuals can find the services which best meet their needs.

Turf issues hamper reform efforts to redesign an effective and innovative workforce development system. Competition between overlapping state advisory councils and agencies is mirrored at the local level. Reform must occur first at the federal and state levels in order to improve local service delivery. Administrative integration might enable program delivery staff to spend more time serving clients and less time on reports and record keeping. Budgetary allocations could be based on identified needs and state and local priorities.

Provide State Direction but Allow Regional Control

An effective workforce development system should meet the needs of California's diverse population and distinct regional economies. Those needs are best determined and addressed at the local level. One size does not fit all. Many existing programs are not responsive to local labor market conditions and in some cases are inadequate and/or out-dated in terms of the type of training they provide. Regional planning and programmatic control are necessary to ensure that job training programs meet business and industry needs. Other states have already created new regional bodies with planning, oversight, and capacity-building responsibilities.

An even bigger problem is that many training programs are not keeping pace with changes in California's economy and with the technological needs of industry. For example, some manufacturing training courses do not include a computer component. Yet most manufacturing operations require intensive knowledge of computer operations. When training programs are not consistent with the workforce needs of growing regional industrial clusters, the training may not assist workers to adequately upgrade their skills. This becomes a more serious problem as new technologies alter the workplace and as new industries, such as multimedia and biotechnology, emerge. By the year 2000, an estimated 41 percent of all jobs will be in higher skilled occupations, compared to 24 percent in 1984.[31] Training programs must be flexible, adaptable, and up-to-date in order to be useful.

Establish One Statewide Council

No single unified strategy exists to address California's workforce needs. Policy coordination is dispersed in multiple policy boards and councils (see page 33 for a list) which are each responsible for a specific categorical program. State policies regarding eligible client population, program terminology and quality control are inconsistent, resulting in inefficient case management and service delivery. Developing a comprehensive, integrated and advanced workforce development system is a necessity if California is to keep and attract high wage employers.

---

[30]The United States General Accounting Office (GAO), Multiple Employment Training Programs: Overlap Among Programs Raises Questions About Efficiency. July, 1994.

[31]Johnston, William B. Workforce 2000 Work and Workers for the 21 Century. Hudson Institute, June 1987, pages 96-101.

Much of the testimony stressed that all workforce preparation programs should be placed under the jurisdiction of one statewide council. At a minimum the council should have authority over JTPA, Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN), the State Council on Vocational Education (SCOVE), the Occupational Information Coordinating Council, the Employment Service and adult vocational education programs, and include other appropriate programs such as School-to-Career. The statewide council should be independent from existing administrative agencies to avoid turf and constituency conflicts.

Some of the issues that a unified statewide council might address include:

- Developing a unified strategic plan and consistent policy to integrate state administration and local service delivery;
- Streamlining services, such as uniform eligibility criteria and standardized clientele enrollment forms;
- Generating accurate and timely state labor market information;
- Improving program evaluation, including establishing statewide performance standards;
- Communicating the results of best practices to local entities;
- Seeking waivers of federal requirements that impede service delivery;
- Reducing duplicative reporting requirements and redundant administrative structures; and
- Connecting workforce preparation programs to the state's economic development strategy of the state.

Performance-Based Accountability

Common performance standards and measurements are critical to the operation of an integrated workforce preparation system. Witnesses at the hearings stressed the value of standardized, locally-adjusted core and performance measures that are outcome-based. Examples might include increases in occupational skills and labor force outcomes (initial employment, wage levels, continuing employment, advancement, and employee/employer satisfaction.) Other performance measurements could include course enrollment, completion, and advancement into other programs. Program delivery could be evaluated using surveys of client satisfaction and by providing greater opportunities for staff input.

There are considerable differences in opinion as to who should monitor performance measures and where the accountability for service choices should be located. For example, a voucher system empowers individual clients to become agents of accountability. If training participants are not satisfied with a particular training provider they can take their vouchers elsewhere. On the other hand, block grants give state agencies the responsibility for ensuring that the programs are satisfactory, with the ability to terminate poor-quality programs. A third approach assigns authority to local councils which presumably are responsive to the needs of the local job seekers and the local business community.

Depending on where one places the responsibility for accountability (with individuals, the state or local councils) there are different program effects. Voucher holders can enroll or withdraw from

services, immediately impacting the accountability of a program. In contrast, it is very likely that the state will take much longer to terminate a marginal program. (In most cases marginal programs are provided additional time to improve performance).

Some job training programs, such as adult education, do not currently have performance measures beyond the number of clients who seek services or walk in the door. In contrast JTPA Title II-A (adult) has four performance standards which measure placement into unsubsidized employment:

- Job retention 13 weeks after placement;
- Follow-up weekly earnings (the total weekly earnings for all adult respondents employed);
- The welfare follow-up employment rate (the total number of adult welfare respondents who were employed); and
- The welfare follow-up weekly earnings (the total weekly earnings for all welfare respondents employed).

Two JTPA youth performance standards measure the number of youths who enter employment and the number who gain an educational goal, such as a GED.[32] JTPA Title III (Dislocated Workers) measures the percentage of adults who enter employment compared to the total number of adults who complete program services. However, JTPA has no sanctions if a state fails to achieve the national standard.

There is considerable interest in Florida's Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP). This statewide data collection system relies on existing state and federal administrative data bases to collect follow-up information on former students or job training program participants. For example, student/participant records are linked to subsequent wage records. The data that are collected include civilian employment, continuing postsecondary education, and military enlistment. Results are compiled and provided to counselors, teachers, and education/training policy makers for planning, evaluation, and career guidance purposes. Since its inception in 1988, FETPIP has tracked more than 1.8 million former students, job training clients, and ex-convicts. It successfully matches about 54 percent of program participants at a cost of about 36 cents each. In contrast, performance data collected by the JTPA system costs an estimated $19 each.[33] (FETPIP's annual budget is approximately $320,000.)

Another approach to accountability is to develop "return-on-investment" measurements. "Return on investment" is typically measured by comparing the cost of training to the amount of money returned to the economy in increased employment and earnings, increased tax contributions due to employment and decreased welfare costs. In addition, employees contribute to the tax base through social security payments, federal and state income taxes, and increased sales tax revenues. In 1994, a GAO project team studied the concept of return-on-investment for JTPA adult and youth training programs. The team identified 5 benefits and 5 limitations. The benefits include: simplicity, low cost, usefulness as a local marketing tool, ability to improve communications with

---

[32]Koehler, Gus. State Government and California University Economic Development Programs. California Research Bureau, California State Library. September 1993.

[33]Florida Department of Education. Student Follow-up Using Automated Record Linkage Techniques: Lessons From Florida's Education and Training Placement Information Program. March, 1995.

Private Industry Councils, and ability to facilitate the best allocation of resources. The limitations include: lack of a control group for determining the net impact of training services; lack of a consistent methodology for comparing return among different local providers; non-JTPA services for which return-on-investment models assume credit; unaccounted for non-monetary benefits such as improved self-esteem; and the limited availability of data. [34]

Seek Waivers From Federal Requirements

The state could seek waivers from appropriate federal agencies in order to utilize common eligibility criteria, registration forms and definitions, and to allow interagency exchange of confidential data for all of the human resource programs under the jurisdiction of a unified state council. However, federal programs administered by the Department of Labor curently offer limited administrative waiver opportunities. Pending federal legislation may considerably broaden the department's waiver authority, however.

Accessible Comprehensive Services (One Stop Shop)

Clients have a difficult time finding the "right" program to serve their training and employment needs. Many witnesses advocated a "one stop" shop service delivery location at which program users could access all of the services they need, thereby avoiding the current confusion of numerous programs and delivery sites. An effective one stop shop might include information on the full range of employment and training services and vocational education along with the necessary support services. It could be established in one physical location or at a number of locations which are unified by electronic sharing of information.

There are various models of "one stop" delivery systems throughout the state, with no consistency in the types of services offered or in the delivery method. For example, the Training and Employment Center in San Jose offers the following program services in one location: JTPA, JOBS (GAIN), Food Stamp Employment Training, adult basic education, GED certification, alternative high school, skills training, labor market information, vocational assessment, foster care independent living skills, infant day care, and job placement services for employers Napa County currently provides all its employment and training services in a "one-stop" career center.. Napa's collaborative model "operates in conjunction with seven state agencies and eighteen local government, education, and non-profit agency partners to provide ... services to the target populations of disadvantaged and dislocated workers and general services to all others".[35] The county finds that multiple federal and state regulations for each separate program make service integration and cross training of staff very difficult.

---

[34]U.S. General Accounting Office. Return-on-Investment: Is This a Meaningful Measure of Training Program Effectiveness? August, 1994.

[35]Napa Valley Private Industry Council. One Stop Career Center System Proposal. Executive Summary.

Develop Common Definitions and Standard Eligibility Requirements

A common set of eligibility criteria might help the state's human resource development system become more efficient and "user friendly". Currently, each employment and training program has different clientele eligibility requirements and a separate eligibility documentation process. For example, the definition of "economically disadvantaged" varies, affecting which individuals may receive a given service. "Economically disadvantaged" may be defined by any of the following general criteria:

- Level of income.
- Welfare status.
- Residency in a depressed area.

Conflicting eligibility definitions result in confusion among programs serving the same target clientele. Federal categorical programs are frequently the reason for dissimilar standards, but the state could act to unify as many eligibility definitions as possible. Block grants may offer an opportunity to accomplish that task. In addition, the state could streamline eligibility by developing an integrated and comprehensive statewide data system with access to wage data, unemployment benefits, welfare grant amounts, SSI records, and other pertinent measurements.

Involve the Private Sector

California's economic development efforts require a close working relationship between businesses and the state's workforce preparation programs. The involvement of the private sector is critical to developing appropriate and successful on-the-job training, school-to-work, and retraining (skills upgrade) programs. New industries and technologies are changing California's economy, demanding enhanced skills from the state's workforce.

Improving service delivery by integrating California's numerous workforce development programs is one important means by which the state can promote economic development. Furthermore, employment and training providers should be offering programs that provide workers with the skills needed by employers. This requires close coordination and planning using common economic and industrial analysis to design occupational training programs. For example, the fact that semi-conductor materials manufacturers are reporting a labor shortage at a time of high state unemployment suggests the need for targeted skills training.

LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE OPTIONS

While not necessarily recommendations of the author or the California Research Bureau, the following are potential options for action. The bracketed number at the end of each option shows a page in this Issue Summary on which a relevant discussion appears.

Summary of Options

Option I. Establish a single state council for policy direction and consolidate multiple employment and training programs under one administrative agency. Mirror that consolidated policy and service delivery structure at the local level.

Option II. Create an independent umbrella workforce preparation council without replacing existing advisory councils. Continue the existing state and local program administrative structure pending the new council's recommendations.

Option III. No change. Maintain the existing structure at the state and local levels. (Federal block grants will likely require program cuts.)

Option IV. Partner with the federal government to enhance program and service delivery flexibility, negotiating waivers of federal regulations in exchange for the delivery of mutually agreed upon outcomes.

Option I. Establish a single state board for policy direction and consolidate employment and training programs under one administrative agency. Mirror that consolidated policy and service delivery same structure at the local level.

State Structure

Legislation would be required to create a single state workforce development council or board, although the Governor could initiate some actions by Executive Order. Successful action might also require the agreement of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

The council would exercise policy-setting responsibilities for all the programs under its purview. At a minimum it could assume the functions of the State Job Training Coordinating Council, the State Council on Vocational Education, the California Occupational Information Coordinating Committee and program advisory groups located in various state departments (see page 33). Many other states have already created similar policy bodies (see Table 6 on page 14 and the detailed discussion of Oregon, Michigan, Massachusetts and Texas above).

One key question is whether the council's jurisdiction should include education. This decision is particularly critical as the federal government and many states plan for integrated "school-to-work" programs that combine education, job training and work experience. For example, the

Oregon Workforce Quality Council is responsible for the implementation of strategies broadly defined to include education, job training and economic development. Representatives from kindergarten through twelth grade schools and higher education have a place on the council. Including literacy training would also bring in libraries and adult education. Vocational education is usually included in a council's jurisdiction.

A single council could respond effectively and quickly should federal block grant proposals be enacted. Congressional proposals allow states to form State Workforce Development Councils or Boards to implement the grants and undertake a collaborative planning and implementation process. A majority of the council members would represent business and industry, labor, workers, and community-based organizations. Additional members could include representatives from state and local government, education, and other employment and training program stakeholders.

Workforce training programs generally serve two complementary goals: enhancing individual skills and job opportunities and community economic development. A unified council could exercise broad policy authority to implement those goals, along with the appropriate budgetary authority. It could advise the Governor on the development of an integrated state and local administrative system. It could monitor and evaluate service delivery by developing performance measures, and oversee the operation of the state and local labor market information system. It could serve as a link between business, industry, labor, education and job training service providers. In addition, the council could promote a unified approach to local service delivery. Contracts with local job training providers, tied to performance standards, could improve service quality and efficiency (see pages 33 and 36).

A Single State Administrative Agency

California's fragmented employment and training administrative structure is inefficient, confusing and creates barriers for clients trying to gain access to services. The lack of a unified administrative and strategic planning focus limit the program benefits which clients and taxpayers receive. State agencies that administer workforce development programs are primarily responsible for employment services, education, health and human services and economic development. They do not easily work together to achieve common goals.

California could simplify this bureaucratic structure by consolidating all relevant workforce development programs into a single operational agency, similar to those described above for Michigan and Texas. The goal of the new agency could be to position California workers to compete in a competitive global economy for high-skilled, high-wage jobs. The new council could recommend which programs should be consolidated into a single operational state agency. The council could be directed to make those recommendations within a specified amount of time, as occurred in Texas. Criteria on which to base its decisions could be similarly specified. Alternatively, the Governor could recommend and/or the enabling legislation could mandate which programs would be included in the new agency's jurisdiction.

If the focus of the new agency is employment and training, the scope of its jurisdiction is potentially quite wide and could probably include most of the 22 programs listed in Table 1 (page 3). Disadvantaged and at-risk clients have priority in many of these programs. The National Commission for Employment Policy and the Welfare Simplification and Coordination Advisory Committee have both recommended consolidating workforce development programs for the needy into a single comprehensive program.[36]

One key initial decision concerns the operational relationship between economic development and workforce development programs. Some states, such as Michigan, have created a unified state administrative structure. Michigan's Office of Workforce Development and Office of Economic Retention and Expansion fall under the jurisdiction of the Michigan Jobs Commission. This approach has the advantage of creating a unified state level working structure, thereby avoiding turf issues between competing agencies and facilitating joint projects and initiatives. A second alternative is to unify economic and workforce development operations at the regional level. For example, Massachusetts funds industrial cluster projects identified by Regional Employment Boards as being essential to regional economic development. Industrial clusters could also be a focus for organizing training modules for workers.

A single state agency could respond effectively to changing business and client needs. It could enable California to develop and administer a state strategic plan for workforce development, thereby targeting resources more efficiently. Pending federal block grant proposals require states to develop a strategic plan that defines a common vision and establishes statewide priorities and policies. That plan should specify performance standards, establish mechanisms to evaluate and monitor program outcomes for improved accountability, build federal-state and state-local partnerships, determine funding needs and allocations (in consultation with localities), and provide technical assistance and capacity-building support. This will require a tremendous amount of coordination. Consolidating California's multiple employment and training programs into one agency could make this task much easier.

A single state agency could also reduce bureaucracy and complexity. A recent GAO report suggests that eliminating the separate staffs that administer, monitor and evaluate job training programs at the state and local levels could save money that might be reallocated to provide services to clients.[37] GAO estimates that administrative costs account for between 7 to 20 percent of the funds spent on public employment and training programs for the economically disadvantaged.[38]

---

[36]United States General Accounting Office. Multiple Employment Training Programs. pg. 7-9.
[37]U.S. General Accounting Office. Multiple Employment Training Programs: Overlapping Programs Can Add Unnecessary Administrative Costs. Washington, D.C., January 28, 1994, p. 8.
[38]Ibid. pg. 8.

Local Structure

Workforce Development Boards

State efforts to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of workforce development programs appear to benefit from consolidated regional planning and coordinating bodies. Several states, such as Oregon, Massachusetts and Texas (see above discussion), have initiated a regional approach to workforce development. California is beginning to form a regional economic development structure composed of Regional Technology Alliances and the Regional Offices of the Trade and Commerce Agency. Regional workforce development boards could be created to complement these economic development organizations.

In order to accomplish this goal, California may need to consolidate its 52 JTPA Service Delivery Areas and Private Industry Councils. The new regional boards would have planning, oversight and budgetary authority over a variety of job training, economic development and education programs, mirroring the responsibilities of the single unified state agency proposed above.

The California Economic Strategy Panel[39] has identified 6 regional economies in the state: San Diego, Los Angeles, the San Francisco Bay Area, the Central Valley Area, the Sacramento Area, and Northern California.[40] Regional workforce development boards mirroring this scheme could be created by legislation or by regional compacts. Funding incentives could encourage the creation of voluntary compacts (such as occurred in Texas). Alternatively, jurisdictional boundaries and participating programs could be prescribed by the state council or by legislation.

The regional boards could consolidate various local advisory policy councils, mirroring a consolidated state administrative structure. This would facilitate strategic planning efforts based on local priorities that support each unique regional economy. Under federal block grant proposals, localities will be responsible for designing and administering the local one stop delivery system, establishing performance measures, evaluating the performance of local providers, and implementing a process to measure service quality and customer satisfaction. Regional boards could also administer regional labor market information systems that identify the job and skill requirements of local industries.

---

[39] Chapter 864, Statutes of 1993.

[40] California Economic Strategy Panel Economic Regions for Planning Cycle I. May 14, 1995.
San Diego Area: San Diego County;
Los Angeles Area: Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, San Bernardino and Ventura counties.
Bay Area: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Monterey, Napa, San Benito, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano and Sonoma counties.
Central Valley Area: Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus and Tulare counties.
Sacramento Area: Butte, Colusa, El Dorado (west slope), Glenn, Placer (west slope), Sacramento, Sutter, Tehama, Yolo and Yuba counties.
Northern California Natural Resource-based Area: Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Del Norte, El Dorado (east slope), Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Lassen, Mariposa, Mendocino, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Placer (east slope), Plumas, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Trinity and Tuolumne counties.

If the federal government provides block grants to the state, the state could also distribute block grants to localities. This approach would provide local governments with greater flexibility to design programs that are tailored to regional economic and local training needs (see page 37).

Regional councils could be composed of a majority of representatives from business and industry, labor, and community-based organizations, as well as representatives of educational institutions and local government. This membership composition would mirror the state council and be consistent with federal legislation.

Workforce Development Areas

The State board or council could determine the boundaries of local workforce development areas, as recommended by regional councils. Some regions, such as Los Angeles, might require more than one workforce development area to effectively implement state and regional goals.

Workforce development areas could establish and administer single points of clientele entry into local workforce preparation and development systems ("one stop" shop). For example, vouchers could be available to eligible adult participants for certified education and training programs. Dislocated workers could sign up for unemployment insurance. Individuals could receive information on jobs in demand, the skills required, the quality/costs/outcomes of appropriate local education and training programs, referral to appropriate education or training programs, and job search assistance, assessment, and counseling.

Option II. Create an independent umbrella workforce preparation council without replacing existing advisory councils. Continue the existing state and local program administrative structure pending the new council's recommendations.

This option would establish an independent council which is separate from existing state agencies and representative of all stakeholders: employers, employees, vocational education and employment and training providers. The council could be responsible for developing general policy goals, engaging in strategic planning, recommending budgetary allocations and conducting oversight based on performance measures. The existing advisory councils (see page 33) would continue to provide recommendations in these specialized areas.

A similar proposal was made by the State Council on Vocational Education (SCOVE) at the May 4, 1995, SB 1417 hearing. SCOVE recommended the creation of a new independent council which would report directly to the Governor, thereby avoiding allegiance to any one state agency. The council would not have governance authority, which would remain the responsibility of existing bodies such as the Board of Education, the Community Colleges Board of Governors, the State Job Training Coordinating Council, SCOVE, and others.

The council could develop the state's response to federal block grant legislation if it is enacted. This might include developing a state workforce preparation plan, setting criteria for the selection of regional workforce development boards, designating local workforce development areas, approving regional plans, and designing criteria for local one-stop career centers. In addition, the

council could be responsible for developing and recommending an appropriate governing structure for California's workforce development system (similar to Texas' two step reform process). In the meantime, the administration of existing employment and training programs would remain the same. This could diminish the opportunities for potential administrative savings from program consolidation.

Local structure

A similar approach could be initiated at the local level. Independent regional councils could be established to design regional plans and develop local programmatic recommendations, without displacing existing structures such as the JTPA Private Industry Councils or the Service Delivery Areas. The membership of the councils could be broadly representative of business, labor, education, and community based organizations, as proposed by pending federal block grant legislation.

Option III. No change. Maintain the existing structure at the state and local levels. (Federal block grants will likely require program cuts.)

If no change is made in state or local governance structures, there are various actions that the state could take to successfully administer federal block grant funds. For example, the Governor could designate a responsible state agency to receive the funds. That agency could develop a state workforce preparation plan and administer the funds. If no plan is developed, funds could continue to be allocated under the existing categorical allocation process. However, it is likely that significant funding cuts will accompany the enactment of federal block grants. At a minimum the state might need to plan on how to respond to those cuts.

Option IV. Partner with the federal government to enhance program and service delivery flexibility, negotiating waivers of federal regulations in exchange for the delivery of mutually agreed upon outcomes.

This option is similar in concept to the "Oregon Option." In essence the state would negotiate a partnership and long-range demonstration project with the federal government to redesign employment and training services, with mutually agreed upon outcomes and federal regulatory waivers. Under the "Oregon Option," Oregon has requested federal workforce funds in a block grant along with waivers of appropriate federal regulations. In return the state has committed to achieving specific measurable outcomes, such as the number of immunized children, the number of retrained and employed workers, and the number of individuals who successfully leave welfare to go to work. The goal is to merge funding categories and streams, thereby creating incentives which reward desirable results and reduce paperwork.

Two recently enacted federal laws, "School-to-Work Opportunities Act" and "Goals 2000: Educate America," authorize states to develop demonstration programs and grant federal agencies the authority to waive regulations in order to successfully implement those demonstration programs. Oregon is the first state to successfully develop a demonstration project under Goals 2000 (Section 311e). The Oregon Option blends federal workforce preparation funds, specifies outcomes, and waives federal regulations. Pending federal legislation furthers this concept. Senate bill 1120 (Dole; sections 761 and 762) grants the Secretary of Labor authority to waive federal requirements to assist states and counties in developing a statewide workforce preparation system. The Health and Human Services Appropriations bill currently before Congress also contains a provision that grants the Secretary of Labor authority to waive certain requirements relating to employment and training programs. The goal of the federal waivers is to remove barriers that hamper states or counties from developing workforce preparation systems.

California could negotiate a partnership with the federal government similiar to the Oregon Option. Changes in state law and regulations would probably be required. This option is particularly important if pending Congressional block grant proposals are not enacted. An outcome-driven funding system could provide the state the opportunity to re-design its workforce preparation programs into a system that better serves its diverse citizens and unique global economy. It could also provide localities greater responsibility for program design and service delivery and encourage an innovative approach to regional problem solving that benefits California's communities and citizens.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Berman, Paul, BW Associates. Mobilizing for Competitiveness: Linking Education and Training to Jobs. The California Business Roundtable. January 1994.

"California Economic Strategy Panel Economic Regions for Planning Cycle I." May 14, 1995.

California Legislative Analyst Office. The 1991-92 State and Local Program Realignment. Overview and Current Issues. February 1992.

Employment Development Department. Employment and Training Programs in California. November 1992.

Employment Development Department. Employment and Training Programs in California. November 1994.

Florida Department of Education. Student Follow-up Using Automated Record Linkage Techniques: Lessons from Florida's Education and Training Placement Information Program. March, 1995.

Ganglass, Evelyn, ed., Excellence at Work: Policy Option Papers. Washington, D.C. National Governors' Association, 1992.

Governor's Task Force on Education and Economic Competitiveness. Proposal for the Creation of the Workforce and Economic Competitiveness Council. April, 1993.

Johnston, William B. Workforce 2000: Work and Workers for the 21 Century. Hudson Institute, June 1987, pages 96-101.

Klerman, Jacob Alex, Karoly, Lynn A. The Transition to Stable Employment: The Experience of U.S. Youth in Their Early Labor Market Career. National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of California, Berkeley. RAND. 1995.

Koehler, Gus. New Challenges to California State Government's Economic Development Engine. California Research Bureau, California State Library. March 1994.

Koehler, Gus. Small Business Networks: Tools to Promote Economic Success. California Research Bureau, California State Library. June 1995.

Koehler, Gus. State Government and California University Economic Development Programs. California Research Bureau, California State Library. September 1993.

Legislative Analyst Office. The 1991-92 State and Local Program Realignment, Overview and Current Issues. February 1992.

MassJobs Council. Annual Report to the Governor and the Legislature. July 1993, to June 30, 1994.

MassJobs Council. Annual Report to the Governor and the Legislature. September 1993.

Michigan Jobs Commission. "Michigan Jobs Team." October 1993.

Michigan Jobs Commission. "Executive Order No. 1993-2."

Michigan Jobs Commission. "Business Plan Executive Summary."

Michigan Jobs Team. Michigan Connections: A Resource Directory of Economic and Workforce Development Programs. October 1993.

McCarthy, Karin. An Overview of Human Resource Investment Councils. Jobs for the Future May 1994.

Napa Valley Private Industry Council. "One Stop Career Center System Proposal." Executive Summary.

National Conference of State Legislators. Racing With the World: How States Can Build a 21st Century Workforce. February 1994.

National Governors' Association. Building State Workforce Development Systems Based on Policy Coordination and Quality Assurance. 1994.

National Governors' Association. Human Resource Investment Councils. 1994.

National Governors' Association. "Congressional Budget Action: Possible Impact on the States." June 30, 1995.

National Governors' Association. Excellence at Work: Policy Option Papers. Washington, D. C. 1992.

National Governors' Association. "The CAREERS Act of 1995." May 9, 1995.

National Governors' Association. Workforce Investment Quarterly. Summer 1995.

Oregon Department of Education. Toward Implementation of the Oregon Educational Act of the 21st Century. Working Designs for Change. January, 1993.

Oregon Progress Board. Oregon Benchmarks. Standards for Measuring Statewide Progress and Institutional Performance. December 1994.

Oregon Workforce Quality Council. "Regional Workforce Quality Committees: Project Reference Guide".

Oregon Workforce Quality Council. "The Bottom Line." January 1993.

The State Job Training Coordinating Council. Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan. April 29, 1994.

The State Job Training Coordinating Council. Response to SB 1417. Developing a New Workforce Preparation System. April 3, 1995.

The State Job Training Coordinating Council. "Minutes of a Joint Meeting of the Coordination and Linkages Committee and the JTPA Oversight Committee." September 13, 1994.

Texas. "Conference Committee Report on HB 1863: Workforce Consolidation Summary." July 1995.

The Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness. "Application for Local Workforce Development Board Certification." May 1995.

The Texas Council on Workforce and Economic Competitiveness. "Proposal for the Creation of the Workforce and Economic Competitveness Council". April, 1993.

The United States General Accounting Office. Multiple Employment Training Programs: Overlapping Programs Can Add Unnecessary Administrative Costs. January 28, 1994.

The United States General Accounting Office. Multiple Employment Training Programs: Overlap Among Programs Raises Questions About Efficiency. July 1994.

U.S. General Accounting Office. "Return-on-Investment: Is this a Meaningful Measure of Training Program Effectiveness." August 1994.

Young, Arthur and Training Research Corporation. Final Report on a Coordination Study of the SJTCC and JTPA. September 1, 1988.